

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **December 29, 2004**.
Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-18** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 10 and 11 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-9 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanabe (U.S. Pat. No. 5,101,284).

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to due to an informality. Claim 1 has been canceled thus making the objection moot.

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 10

Dependent claim 10 was indicated to contain allowable subject matter and has now been rewritten in independent form. Claim 10, along with dependent claim 11, should now be in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 2-9 and 12 are now dependent from claim 10 and should be in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite an image-capturing device that comprises a calibration member and a cleaning member similar to the allowable subject matter of claim 10. The cited references fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in

claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the references of record and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 15 and 16

Claim 15, dependent from independent claim 14 has been amended to recite an inner surface formed within the wheel assembly for receiving a force that causes the wheel assembly to rotate. Figure 5 of the present application illustrates an example configuration of a wheel assembly 52 with such an inner surface (e.g. surface 60). Thus, no new matter has been added.

Tanabe fails to teach or suggest the claimed wheel assembly since the platen roller 7 has no inner surface for receiving a force that causes the platen roller 7 to rotate. For this additional reason, claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Tanabe.

Claim 16 further recites a cam abutting the inner surface of the wheel assembly. Tanabe fails to teach or suggest this feature and for this additional reason, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Tanabe.

Independent Claim 17

Independent claim 17 has been amended to recite cleaning the calibration strip. A calibration member along with a cleaning member as recited in claim 10 was indicated as allowable subject matter. Thus, a method of calibrating and cleaning as recited in claim 17 is not taught or suggested by the references of record. For example, Tanabe does not teach or suggest cleaning of the correction plate 18. Therefore, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over the references of record and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 has been amended to recite the wheel having a curved outer surface being less than 360 degrees in circumference forming an open portion and that the cam being positioned within the open portion of the wheel. The recited features are supported by, for example, Figures 4-6 and their corresponding sections in the present application. Thus, no new matter has been added.

Tanabe only describes a platen roller that does not have an open portion and does not include the cam as recited in claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is not taught or suggested by Tanabe and claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Tanabe.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 2-18** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

29-MAR-2005



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843